



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of this edition is apparent and it will supersede Koechly's. At last we have a text which makes the poem not only readable but even enjoyable.

I have noted one misprint: $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\pi\omega$ (22.2) for $\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\pi\omega$; in some instances Koechly is not given credit for readings corrected in his Preface, e.g., $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and other words in $\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ without iota subscript in 3.413; 5.9; 10.100, etc. It is evident that the references to parallel passages in Homer and other authors could be easily added to, though the editor deserves thanks for indicating for the first time many in authors seldom read.

G. W. PASCHAL

WAKE FOREST, N.C.

Q. *Horatius Flaccus*. Erklärt von ADOLF KIESSLING. Zweiter Teil: *Satiren*. Vierte Auflage besorgt von RICHARD HEINZE. Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1910. Pp. xxxiii+299. M. 3.50.

The merits of Kiessling's edition of Horace are well known. In a seven-line preface Heinze declares that, though the present edition of the *Sermones* differs less from the third edition than that had differed from the second (prepared by Kiessling himself), still in numerous places he has made alterations by abbreviations or additions. The additions are not indicated by any typographical device; to find them (or other changes) one must compare this edition line by line with its predecessor. In accordance with the excellent German fashion, so superior to our own, the book has been reset throughout.

The present edition contains xxxiii+299 pages against xxxii+284 of the third. Part of the apparent increase is due to more open composition, which improves the appearance of the book and makes it easier to read.

In the *Einleitung*, in the first part dealing with "Die horazische Satire" (ix-xxii) there is little change. There is less dogmatism on p. x concerning Livy's account (7.2) of the Italian forms of the drama; the suggestion that Accius was Livy's source (cf. Hendrickson, *Am. Jour. Phil.* IX, 285-311) has been withdrawn. Kiessling's suggestion that Livy's source, in writing of the *Satura*, was seeking in Latin literature an analogue to the $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\iota$ (a suggestion which has always seemed to me to have sprung from a misunderstanding or perversion of what O. Jahn wrote in *Hermes* 2. 225-26) has also been withdrawn. One or two other slight changes on pp. x-xi show the influence of the views set forth by Marx (in the *Prolegomena* to his *Lucilius*). On p. x Heinze refrains from stating the birth year of Lucilius (in the 3d edition [1906] he gave it as 180: so in 1904 Marx, *Lucilius* i, xxii); on 2.1.34 he holds that Lucilius cannot have been "beträchtlich jünger als sein Freund Scipio (geb. 184)." He seems to have overlooked the discussion of the matter in Sellar *Roman Poets of the Republic* 231, in Cichorius *Untersuchungen*

zu *Lucilius* 13, and in my review of Marx' *Lucilius*, *Am. Jour. Phil.* 29. 468, n., 471. On p. xvi the remark is repeated from the 3d edition that in Rome the civil wars awakened a desire to reach moral purification, which only philosophy could satisfy. This point was well made by Norden, in the *Einleitung* (p. 3) to his edition of *Aeneid* vi; in this desire Norden sees one explanation of such literary productions as *Aeneid* vi, in so far as that book seeks to explain man's destiny after death. I should like to know what authority there is for the flat statement (xxi) that by the gift of the Sabine Farm Maecenas paid Horace for dedicating to him *Sermones* I.

The second part of the *Einleitung* ("Sprachliches und Metrisches," xxii-xxxiii) is practically identical with the corresponding pages of the preceding edition. On xxiv, top, *Serm.* 2.3.1 is cited now as beginning *Sic raro scribis* (not, as in the 3d edition, *Si raro scribis*), a great improvement (Gow's treatment of this passage shows his edition at its most prosaic worst). This part of the Introduction is of very great value. Yet it might have been made more valuable, (a) had Horace's metrical practices been compared or contrasted more fully with those of other satirists (compare the fine paper by Professor Smith in Wilson's *Juvenal* lix-lxxii), (b) had there been added a general discussion of the colloquialisms in Horace. There are many good notes on the latter theme, but they might with profit have been brought together, and a reference to F. Barta's treatise, *Sprachliche Studien zu den Satiren des Horaz* (Linz: Part I, 1897, Part II, 1881), would have helped many.

Of the notes there is little room to speak in detail. Instead of making a detailed comparison I will offer some remarks on various points.

Horace's debts to Lucretius find mention in the notes. One would, however, like a reference to some general discussion of this point, e.g., to Ad. Weingaertner *De Horatio Lucretii imitatore*, in the *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 2.1-50, or to Professor W. A. Merrill's paper, "On the Influence of Lucretius on Horace," in the *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* I, 111-29. It may be said that in this edition of Horace references to the "literature" are not in general given.

The date of the journey described in 1.5 is still given as the spring of 37 B.C. I agree rather with the argument of Professor Kirkland (in his edition of 1893, based on Kiessling's first edition), that the journey was made in the fall of 38. On 1. 1. 108 a curious blunder is repeated from the first edition; *ut avarus* is explained as = *utpote avarus*, and *ut male sanos* (*Epp.* 1. 19. 3) is cited as parallel. But in the note on *Epp.* 1. 19. 3, in editions 1 and 3, *ut* is rightly taken as "zeitlich." The repetition of such an error surely shows too much reverence for the *ipsissima verba* of the *auctor mortuus*. In 1. 1. 10 *sub galli cantum* Heinze still regards as "komische Uebertreibung"; see, however, *Am. Jour. Phil.* XVIII, 329-31. In 1. 10. 27 the reading and pointing are *scilicet oblitos* (so Bentley for *oblitos*) *patriaeque patrisque Latini*, though it is admitted that "dabei hat der Zwischensatz *cum Pedius eqs.* bisher

wenigstens eine befriedigende Erklärung nicht gefunden." I do not understand why editors will "vex" an entirely transparent passage. If there are principles of interpretation at all (such as that we must proceed from the known to the unknown), the *cum*-clause shows clearly that *Latine* (not *Latini*) must be read and that *oblitus* is right. On *quine putetis* (1. 10. 21) the note merely declares that *-ne* has "verstärkenden Wert: 'wirklich,' wie in *plane hicine est, qui in Epidauro primus pudicitiam mihi pepulit*, Plaut. *Epid.* 541 und so öfters in der Komödie." But to me there is a difference between *Epid.* 541, as read by Heinze (and Lindsay: but see Gray *ad loc.*) and the Horatian passage. Is the *qui*-clause interrogative or relative? Do we find "öfters in der Komödie" or elsewhere the asseverative *-ne* in a relative clause? Professor Elmer's discussion of this passage in *Proceedings of the American Philological Association XXIII* (1892) xviii-xxiii, though sadly neglected by editors of Horace, is worth studying.

I miss notes on various points. There is no explanation of *quam sibi* in *Serm.* 1. 1. 1. We have here a good example of syntactical fusion. Horace has conflated (a) *ut nemo quam ei sortem vel ratio dederit vel fors obiecerit illa*, etc., and (b) *ut nemo sua sorte, seu eam ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit contentus vivat*. This matter of syntactical fusion yet awaits investigation; for instances of it in Vergil see my edition of the *Aeneid*, Index, s.v. "Confusion," p. 537. The note on *dum ne sit te ditior alter* (1. 1. 40) is not adequate. The translation "provided that," "as long as" (accepted even by Professor Morris) gives an illogical result. What sense is there in saying "nothing bars your way, provided that no one is richer than you," seeing that he cannot tell whether any one else will be richer than he till all his efforts are done and over with? We have here a simple case of oratio obliqua; *dum ne me sit ditior alter* is modified to the Horatian form by indirect discourse. Plautus *Cap. Prol.* 32: *nihil pretio parsit filio dum parceret*, and Livy 21. 26. 9: *nihil, dummodo innare aquae et capere onera possent*, said of the builders of the dugouts, are to be interpreted in like manner. *triverit*, 1. 1. 45, cannot, to my mind, be *futurum exactum*, in parataxis (so too Morris), unless a heavier stop than a comma be set after verse 45. The form is to me clearly subjunctive, with the oracular tone that Horace assumes elsewhere, e.g., in this very piece, in 73-74: *Nescis quo valeat nummus, quem praebeat usum? Panis ematur, holus*, etc.; here to me *ematur* is subjunctive of command, the sense being "Take your money and buy with it," etc. The function of *vel* (1. 1. 49) is not well explained; it joins the question in 49 ff. to the question of 44; *vel dic quid referat*, 49, is an emotional substitute for *vel quid refert* . . . ? See *Classical Review* X, 428. The note on *congestis undique saccis* (1. 1. 70) might have been much improved, I think, by a reference to my note on this passage in *Classical Review* X, 429. Further, Heinze thinks the comparison "hätte ein dem *captat* entsprechendes *inhias* geheischt." This is, I think, wrong. *captat* is balanced by *parcere* . . . *cogeris*, 71-72. The note on *ut vivam Naevius aut sic ut Nomentanus* (1. 1. 100) might have

been improved had the editor noted, first, that Horace is fond of metaphor as against simile and, secondly, that here we have a metaphor followed by a simile, as in *Epod.* 1. 33-34. Cf. *fortissima Tyndaridarum* (1. 1. 100), *rusticus expectat* (*Epp.* 1. 2. 42). To speak of *ut* as omitted before *Naevius* (Heinze, Palmer) is to spoil a fine practice of Horace. The note on *ut avarus* (1. 1. 108) might have profited from an examination of my discussion of this verse in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XVIII, 332-34; Heinze still regards *ut avarus* as = *utpote avarus*. He is right in reading *qui nemo*, but he is wrong, I think, in saying that Horace, not being a psychological investigator, will not trouble himself to give an answer to his question here. He does give the answer; he drifts into the answer imperceptibly in 110 ff., to state it more clearly in 113 ff. (I am glad to see that Heinze here disregards the discussion of this passage by Professor Postgate in *Classical Review* XV, 302-3).

On many other points I have comments I should like to make. What lover of Horace has not? *Sed ohe iam satis est*; I would not be accounted a Crispinus. The matters discussed above belong to the realm of the subjective; if I am right, they are *egregio inspersi corpore naevi*.

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1911. \$3.

After a lapse of seven years Mr. Platner's useful manual appears in a new edition. The enlargement is fortunately not great. The first edition had 514 pages; the second has 538, the typographical scheme remaining unchanged. A comparison of the two issues reveals a very large number of small improvements in phraseology and corrections of erroneous or unprecise statements, besides the to-be-expected changes due to the advancement of investigation since the first edition was published. The author appears to have kept track of all publications in the field during this interval, and to have made them available for his purposes by proper intellectual digestion. The mass of footnotes that make the book particularly valuable for purposes of study has been considerably enriched. Naturally enough the unadorned style that made the work appear a somewhat labored effort in the first instance has not vanished. Perhaps it were a counsel of perfection to utter even a longing for such a consummation. The apiarian virtues of industry and precision are perhaps after all the crowning virtues for such a work. Mr. Platner in his discussion of the early days of Rome still clings with puritan stubbornness to his earlier espoused Richterian doctrines. The present reviewer, in his less rigid regard for his *mumpsimus*, must be permitted to lament that his friend still labors to swallow the camel of belief in a